

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application.

Claims 1-20 are now present in this application. Claims 1 and 15 are independent.

Amendments have been made to the Title, and claims 1, 10, 15 and 17 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Priority Under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging Applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of the certified priority document.

Drawings

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that the drawings are acceptable.

Information Disclosure Citation

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the references supplied with the Information Disclosure Statements filed June 9, 2006; August 15, 2006; February 26, 2008; September 3, 2008 and May 13, 2009, and for providing Applicants with initialed copies of the PTO-SB08 forms filed therewith.

Specification Amendments

The title has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 10 and 17 because of several informalities. In order to overcome this objection, Applicants have amended claims 10 and 17 in order to correct the deficiencies pointed out by the Examiner. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103

Claims 1-3, 11, 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Liu. Claims 4-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Liu. Further, claims 7-9 and 12 stand rejected as being obvious over Liu in view of Ha et al., claim 10 stands rejected as being obvious over Liu in view of Ha et al. and Kurematsu, claims 15, 16 and 18-20 stand rejected as being obvious over Liu in view of Ha et al. and Shimamura, and claim 17 stands rejected as being obvious over Liu in view of Ha et al., Kurematsu and Shimamura. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejections, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination of elements in a liquid crystal display device including a transfective liquid crystal panel, a front light unit for supplying a light for displaying an image, and a micro lens sheet for receiving the light incident from the front light unit, and condensing the incident light on the transfective liquid crystal panel. The micro lens sheet is disposed between the transfective liquid crystal panel and the front light unit.

Applicants respectfully submit that this combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 1 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Liu.

Claim 1 now specifies that the micro lens sheet is disposed between the transfective liquid crystal panel and the front light unit, as depicted in Figures 1-3 of the application. In the rejection based on Liu, the Examiner states that the micro lens sheet is seen in Figures 8 or 9, depicting a color filter substrate. But, as seen in Figure 18 of Liu, the color filter substrate is within the liquid display panel. Claim 1 now clearly distinguishes the invention over Liu. Claim 15 has been amended in a similar manner as claim 1 to present claims of varying scope and the secondary references relied upon by the Examiner do not cure the deficiencies of Liu noted above.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combinations of elements as set forth in independent claims 1 and 15 are not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record,

including Liu, for the reasons explained above. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

With regard to dependent claims 2-14 and 16-20, Applicants submit that these claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1 or 15 which are allowable for the reasons set forth above, and therefore claims 2-14 and 16-20 are allowable. In addition, these claims recite further limitations which are not disclosed or made obvious by the applied prior art references. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.


If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Chris McDonald, Registration No. 41,533, at (703) 205-8000, in the Washington, D.C. area.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: September 28, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

James T. Eller, Jr. *JTE*
Registration No.: 39,538
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant